



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*m'*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N
09/892,593	06/27/2001	F. Mark Ferguson	SHP025.1	4461

7590 10/05/2004

Mark S. Leonardo, Esq.  
Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels LLP  
One Financial Center  
Boston, MA 02111

EXAMINER
----------

WILLIAMS, CATHERINE SERKE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3763

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/892,593

Applicant(s)

FERGUSON ET AL.

Examiner

Catherine S. Williams

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 14-90 and 93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21, 22, 24, 26, 32-59, 61, 66-68, 73-90 and 93 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 71 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-7, 11, 14-19, 23, 25, 27-31, 60, 62-65, 69, 70 and 72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 8, 9 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,4-7,11,14-19,23,25,27-31,60,62-63,65,69-70 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gyure et al (US Pat# 5,665,075) in view of Sweeney et al (USPN 5,348,544). Gyure discloses a needle shield assembly that includes a needle hub (28) with an open ended needle and a shield (45). See figure 2. The needle hub has a monolithically formed collar (34) that receives the proximal end of the shield (43). The collar also has an interior cavity. See figure 2. The shield has a lock (58) that flexibly and irreversibly captures (locks) a portion of the needle disposed proximal to the distal end of the needle when in the extended position. See figures 4 and 10. The shield encloses at least a portion of the distal end of the needle. See figures 3 and 4. The proximal end of the shield (41) is received by the collar (34) of the needle hub in interlocking engagement. See figures 2 and 7. As shown in figure 2, the needle hub has a luer fitting (29) for attaching to a syringe. The needle hub includes guide surfaces (flange 33) to facilitate engagement of the shield and needle hub. The shield has a proximal segment and at least one rib (69) with a transverse orientation for urging the shield to the extended position. See figure 4. The shield also includes at least one hinge (see figures 1-4) that has a relief (83). The hinge flexes inwardly. See figure 1.

Art Unit: 3763

Gyure meets the claim limitations as described above but fails to include the proximal end of the needle shield being received within the cavity of the needle hub collar. However, Gyure does teach a proximal end of a needle shield being received by (surrounding) a collar of a needle hub. See above.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to rearrange the parts of the proximal end of the needle shield and the collar of Gyure so that the proximal end of the shield is received into the collar of the needle hub. The courts have found the rearrangement of parts unpatentable if the rearrangement does not modify the operation of the device (In re Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950)) and an obvious matter of design choice (In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ7 (CCPA 1975)). Rearranging the Gyure reference to have the proximal end of the needle shield locking into the cavity of the collar would not modify the overall operation of the device (i.e.) shielding the needle. Additionally, applicant has not disclosed that having the proximal end of the shield locking into the cavity of the collar provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the proximal end of the needle shield locking into engagement with the outside of the collar as taught by Gyure.

Gyure meets the claim limitations as described above but fails to include a shield having a plurality of hingedly connected segments or a shield having a distal end that extends parallel to the longitudinal axis of the needle. However, Sweeney discloses such as segmented shield that extends parallel to the longitudinal axis of the needle. See figures 2-4. Also, the invention includes a lock/linear bearing for the needle in the extended position (44); an articulating

Art Unit: 3763

actuator (54); and segments connected by living hinges that have relief portions that are configured to flex inwardly (see figure 3). Sweeney discloses that the prior art hinged needle shields that rotate 90 degrees into a protective position are less desirable. Sweeney further asserts that the segmented needle shield construction is advantageous and solves the problems of the rotated shields. See 1:33-49.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of a segmented shield into the invention of Gyure. Sweeney states that one problem with the rotated shield is "shields of this type can interfere with the usage of" and "can visually obscure the tip of the needle cannular during use." See 1:38-40. The motivation (provided by Sweeney) for making the shield of Gyure (45) segmented would have been to solve the problem in the art and enhance the use of the device.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to incorporate the distal segment of Sweeney having the locking/bearing surface into the invention of Gyure. It is well known in the art to incorporate a irreversible locking mechanism into a needle cap to prevent further use of the needle and needle sticks. The motivation would have been to enhance the overall safety of the device.

Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gyure in view of Sweeney. Gyure in view of Sweeney meets the claim limitations as described above for claim 5 but fails to include a double wall needle.

At the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a double wall needle because applicant has not disclosed

Art Unit: 3763

that using a double wall needle provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with a regular hypodermic needle. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Gyure to obtain the invention as specified in claim 64.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 71 is allowed.

Claims 3,8-9 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Catherine S. Williams whose telephone number is 703-308-4846. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

Art Unit: 3763

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas D. Lucchesi can be reached on 703-308-2698. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Catherine S. Williams *CSW*  
October 3, 2004

  
LOAN H. THANH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER